

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. No new matter has been added.

II. Informalities

Claim 16 was objected in view of various informalities identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully submitted since claim 16 has been amended to resolve the problems identified by the Examiner.

III. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 11, 17, 18 and 21-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claims 10, 15, 19 and 20 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 10, 12-16, 19 and 20 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of

protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

IV. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to recite statutory subject matter. This rejection is considered moot based on the cancellation of claims 22 and 23.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claim 15, since claim 15 has been amended to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 10-13, 15 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kitani and Urano. Further, claims 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitani in view of various combinations Urano, Colvin, Kawakami and Lisanke. The rejections regarding claims 11, 17, 19 and 21-23 are considered moot based on their above-mentioned cancellation. Further, these rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 10, 19 and 20 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 10 recites a server including a receiving unit that receives terminal information from each respective terminal of a plurality of terminals, the terminal information received from each respective terminal including (i) key identification information that is unique to secret key information, the secret key information and the key identification information being assigned to the respective terminal in advance, (ii) authentication information that is defined based on the secret key information, and (iii) additional identification information that is assigned to the respective terminal. In addition, claim 10 recites that the server includes a selection unit that outputs at least one of the secret key information and the public key information, based on the key identification information included in the terminal information received by the receiving unit, wherein the at least one of the secret key information and the public key information output by the selection unit is held in a holding unit.

Further, claim 10 recites that the server includes a verification unit that verifies the authentication information received by the receiving unit, based on the at least one of the secret key information and the public key information output by the selection unit. Claim 10 also recites that the server includes a search unit that searches the server terminal information held in the holding unit, based on the key identification information. Finally, claim 10 recites that the server includes a judgment unit that judges that a terminal, of the plurality of terminals, that corresponds to the additional identification information is an unauthorized terminal when a predetermined number or more of different pieces of additional identification information has been searched by the search unit, for identical key identification information.

Kitani, Urano, Colvin, Kawakami, and Lisanke, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as recited in amended

independent claim 10.

Rather, Kitani merely teaches that a server has the ability to detect an unauthorized terminal, and Urano merely teaches that log-in information can be used to determine a place of a terminal.

In view of the above, it is clear that the combination of Kitani and Urano teach that an unauthorized terminal can be detected by using log-in information to determine a place of the terminal, but fails to disclose or suggest (A) outputting at least one of the secret key information and the public key information, based on the key identification information, (B) verifying the authentication information received by the receiving unit, based on the at least one of the secret key information and the public key information output by the selection unit, (C) searching the server terminal information held in the holding unit, based on the key identification information, and (D) judging that a terminal, of the plurality of terminals, that corresponds to the additional identification information is an unauthorized terminal when a predetermined number or more of different pieces of additional identification information has been searched by the search unit, for identical key identification information, as required by claim 10.

More specifically, the Applicants submit that the combination of Kitani and Urano fails to disclose or suggest that, based on the key identification information, the secret key information and/or the public key information are output, and based on the output secret key information and/or public key information, the authentication information is verified, as required by claim 10.

Additionally, the Applicants submit that the combination of Kitani and Urano fails to disclose or suggest that, based on the key identification information of the terminal and based on

searches for identical key identification information, the server judges whether the terminal is an unauthorized terminal, as required by claim 10.

Furthermore, Applicants note that Colvin, Kawakami and Lisanke were relied upon for teaching the features of various dependent claims. However, Colvin, Kawakami and Lisanke also do not disclose features that remedy the deficiencies of the combination of Kitani and Urano, as discussed above.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 10 and claims 12-16 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of the referenced prior art.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kitani, Urano, Colvin, Kawakami, and/or Lisanke or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kitani, Urano, Colvin, Kawakami, and/or Lisanke to obtain the invention of independent claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 10 and claims 12-16 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 19 and 20 are directed to a system and a method, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 10. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19 and 20 are allowable over the referenced prior art.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application

is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Motoji OHMORI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.09.08 16:10:11 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 8, 2009